EXHIBIT D

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI EASTERN DIVISION

JOHN BARNHARDT, ET AL

Plaintiffs

V.

CASE NO. 4:65-cv-1300-HTW-LGI

MERIDIAN MUNICIPAL SEPARATE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Defendant.

TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE

BEFORE HONORABLE HENRY T. WINGATE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

May 18, 2023 Jackson, Mississippi

The proceedings were reported by a stenographic court reporter. The transcript was produced using computer-aided transcription.

Margaret Wasmund, RDR, CRR, CRC
Court Reporter
2851 Shiloh Road
Pelahatchie, Mississippi 39145
margaretwasmund@qmail.com/601-329-6113

APPEARANCES:

REPRESENTING THE PLAINTIFFS:

John Spencer Cusick, Esquire NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund, Inc. 40 Rector Street, 5th Floor New York, NY 10006-1738

REPRESENTING THE DEFENDANT:

John Simeon Hooks, Esquire Adams and Reese 1018 Highland Colony Parkway, Suite 800 Ridgeland, MS 39157

John G. Compton, Esquire Witherspoon & Compton, LLC 1100 23rd Avenue Meridian, MS 39301

REPRESENTING THE INTERVENOR:

Natane Singleton, Esquire Aria Vaughan, Esquire U.S. Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20530

ALSO PRESENT:

Dr. Amy Carter, Superintendent Meridian Public School District

Ms. Jamie Dole, Paralegal

Ordinarily -- ordinarily -- when a bound individual to a court's clear declarations, as they would be in a case like this, to move forward to close a school, the entities involved know that the desegregation plan calls for the court's approval. The school system apparently ignored that particular facet and seemingly was moving forward on the elementary school, again, without notifying the court and getting the court's approval.

And the key is court's approval, not what they thought was going to happen, not what they thought was going to result in a settlement. But there is a procedure for this, and the school system didn't follow it on the first instance and seemingly, had this call not been made, may not have followed it on the second.

So I asked the question the other day as to whether Mr. Cusick was arguing here that because of this failure would that be enough in of itself to negate all the actions of the school system with regard to the middle school and even with regard to the elementary school? Would that factor alone be enough to say that the school district is not in compliance with its obligations to the court?

Now then, Dr. Carter, you had your hand up, so do you have something you want to add?

DR. CARTER: Yes, sir. Thank you, Your Honor. At the end of each one of our community meetings, our parent

meetings, I ended with next steps. And the final next step on that list was to notify the courts and pending approval for the elementary reconfiguration plan.

So I have that document. I can send it to the court if need be, but I ended each one of those sessions letting the community know the next step would be to notify the court regarding what we were doing with the elementary reconfiguration.

So please don't think this time around the district disregarded the fact that it needed to come before the court because that was the last item on the next steps list that I shared in every community meeting. So I just wanted to clarify that, Your Honor. I don't know if it helps or hurts, but I wanted to clarify that.

THE COURT: Well, a surmise that a matter might be subject to compromise and settlement still does not excuse the school system from securing the approval. And because there was no approval secured, then Mr. Cusick is still maintaining his objection.

So now, if the court is going to rule with the school system on its address of Carver Middle, the court still has to make some mention of the school district's failure to obtain approval, and then the court has to make some determination of what weight to be given to that in the overall appraisal of this entire situation. As I said before, this is why the court